

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed January 14, 2005, in which the Examiner rejected all previously pending claims. With this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1, 19, 35 and 38, canceled claims 18, 20 and 48, and added new claims 51 and 52. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Claim Amendments

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the features described in previously submitted claims 18 and 20 (now canceled). Accordingly, previously submitted claim 20 has been rewritten in independent form as independent claim 1.

Independent claim 38 has been amended to include the features described in previously submitted claim 48 (now canceled). Accordingly, previously submitted claim 48 has been rewritten in independent form as independent claim 38.

Claim 46 has been rewritten in independent form as new claim 51, which includes the features previously set forth in claims 38, 45 and 46.

Claim 47 has been rewritten in independent form as new claim 52, which includes the features previously set forth in claims 38, 45 and 47.

Applicant submits that the above-described amendments do not raise any new issues that would require further consideration and/or a new search, since each of the claims of the application as presently amended were submitted for consideration by the Examiner in the previous Office Action. Applicant believes that the amendments place the application in condition for allowance. At a minimum, the amendments place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal. Furthermore, Applicant has canceled more claims than have been added. As a result, Applicant requests that all of the

amendments be entered and the amended claims considered by the Examiner in light of the discussion below.

Rejections of Independent Claim 1

In Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected independent claim 1 (previously presented as claim 20) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Strauss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,964,458) in view of Saito (JP59180224). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assessment of the cited references.

In particular, Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's finding that Strauss et al. disclose a self-contained wheeled power unit for conditioning space that is "controlled from the panel 88 or remotely which had meters for the electrical outlets, pressure and temperature gauges, switches, and controls for the components, circuit breakers, etc." [emphasis added] At column 9, lines 42-45, Strauss et al. state "All apparatus was controlled from the panel 88 which had meters for the electrical outlets, pressure and temperature gauges, switches and controls for the components, circuit breakers, etc." Accordingly, Strauss et al. disclose that control for the apparatus is performed only by the panel 88, rather than remotely, as described in independent claim 1. Applicant is unaware of any disclosure in Strauss et al. regarding the remote control of the apparatus.

Strauss et al. do mention the use of extension cables 86 (FIG. 1) that are "connected to the right-hand outlets 76 for use by the workmen in the manhole 82 as for example in energizing tools, instruments, and the like at the site below ground." [Column 5, lines 52-57] However, such power extension cables do not operate as the "remote control" described in independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent claim 1 is non-obvious in view of the cited references since they fail to disclose each of the elements of the claim, and requests that the

rejection be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicant submits that all pending claims depending from claim 1 are allowable as being dependent from an allowable base claim, and requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

In Section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected independent claim 1 (previously presented as claim 20) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nathan (U.S. Patent No. 4,450,900) in view of Saito (JP59180224). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assessment of the cited references.

In the argument presented in Section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner mentions that Nathan discloses that "the operation of the unit is controlled from operating controls (not shown) where variable controls enable temperature and humidity to be selected. The controls include mechanical and electrical devices, preferably solid state, to maintain temperature and humidity at preset levels." However, the Examiner provides no mention of either of the cited references disclosing "a remote control for providing various inputs to the controller, wherein the controller controls operation of the air cooling unit in response to the inputs from the remote control", as described in independent claim 1, or where such disclosure is provided. Applicant submits that Nathan fails to disclose the claimed remote control.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 is non-obvious in view of the cited references since they fail to disclose each of the elements of the claim, and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicant submits that all pending claims dependent from claim 1 are allowable as being dependent from an allowable base claim, and requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

#### Rejection of Independent Claim 38

In Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected

independent claim 38 (previously presented as claim 48) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Strauss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,964,458) in view of Saito (JP59180224). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assessment of the cited references.

As mentioned above with regard to claim 1, the cited references fail to disclose "a remote control configured to control operations of the air cooling unit from a location that is displaced from the air cooling unit", as described in independent claim 38. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 38 is non-obvious in view of the cited references since they fail to disclose each of the elements of the claim, and request that the rejection be withdrawn. Additionally, Applicant submits that all pending claims depending from claim 38 are allowable as being dependent from allowable base claim, and request that the rejections be withdrawn.

#### Rejections of Independent Claim 51

In Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected independent claim 51 (previously presented as claim 46) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Strauss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,964,458) in view of Saito (JP59180224). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assessment of the cited references.

In particular, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest "a cable having a first end within the interior chamber of the tent and connected to the temperature sensor, and a second end located outside of the interior chamber of the tent and connected to the controller, whereby the temperature output signal is provided to the controller through the cable", as described in claim 51. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 51 is non-obvious in view of the cited references since they fail to disclose each of the elements of the claim.

In Section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 51 (previously presented as claim 46) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nathan (U.S. Patent No. 4,450,900) in view of Saito (JP59180224). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assessment of the cited references.

In particular, although the Examiner found Nathan to disclose controls that "include mechanical and electrical devices, preferably solid state, to maintain temperature and humidity at preset levels", the Examiner failed to identify where the cited references disclose "a cable having a first end within the interior chamber of the tent and connected to the temperature sensor, and a second end located outside of the interior chamber of the tent and connected to the controller, whereby the temperature output signal is provided to the controller through the cable", as described in claim 51. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 51 is non-obvious in view of the cited references since they fail to disclose each of the elements of the claim.

#### Rejection of Claim 52

In Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 52 (previously presented as claim 47) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Strauss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,964,458) in view of Saito (JP59180224). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assessment of the cited references.

In particular, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest "a temperature sensor configured to produce a temperature output signal that is indicative of a temperature within the interior chamber of the tent, wherein the temperature output signal is wirelessly transmitted; [and] a controller configured to control operation of the air cooling unit in response to the temperature output signal", as described in claim 52. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 52 is non-obvious in view of the

cited references since they fail to disclose each of the elements of the claim.

Conclusion

In view of the above comments and remarks, Applicant respectfully believes that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: 

Alan G. Rego, Reg. No. 45,956  
Suite 1600 - International Centre  
900 Second Avenue South  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319  
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 339-3312

AGR/BDK/djb